

**LEFT-WING FREEMASONRY:
A FRAMEWORK FOR IDEOLOGY AND ORGANIZATION IN THE
MIDDLE OF THE 19TH CENTURY**

by
MIKLÓS KUN

In memoriam David Borisovich Rjazanov

Recent years have seen Marxist historiography successfully treating the subject of freemasonry. New vistas have been opened up – but possibilities are far from being exhausted.¹ Those preoccupied in the topic – and especially in the history of its left wing – will necessarily come across some problems and points of contact leading to other essential problem areas, e.g. to the history of socialist ideas and to the early labour movement. This is the conclusion that can be drawn from the study of hundreds of Europeans taking part in the petty bourgeois radical movements of the 19th century, as well as from that of some pioneers in the international labour movement, and even of the International Workmen's Association, – thus also from the study of Michail Aleksandrovič Bakunin.

During his years of acclimatization in Florence, this Russian revolutionary was mainly surrounded by liberals and petty bourgeois democrats; most of them, Italians and foreigners alike, were freemasons as well. The participation of Bakunin in the movement does not stand clear to us even today. What we know is that he brought about the "*Société Internationale Secrète de l'émancipation de l'humanité*" (further: *Société*) – his first secret organization with a program differing in many respects from that of the traditional conspirative societies – in Italy in 1864. The correlation of these two facts might prove significant in evaluating his stay in Italy, which was essential in the formation of the ideology of "Bakuninian" anarchism.

His relations with the freemasons were first mentioned by M. Nettelau.² Relying on information supplied by A. Reichel, a teacher of music and a close acquaintance of Bakunin in the 1840s, Nettelau almost certainly excluded the possibility of his entering the movement during his first period of emigration, between 1844 and 1849. Consequently, the question that Nettelau put is, whether Bakunin could have become a freemason only in Florence, in 1864.³ In the same work, Nettelau published a writing of Bakunin which had an exclusively masonic concern. This source-material, hitherto singular in its kind, was republished at the beginning of the century by G. Domanico, the Italian historian of the 1st International,⁴ and – incorrectly and defectively – recently by the periodical "Documentes Anarchistes".⁵

With the exception of Nettlau, the biographers of Bakunin have hardly, or not at all, pointed out his attachment to freemasonry — excusing themselves usually by reference to the lack of sources. The significance, and sometimes even the existence, of such relations have been questioned. It is interesting to note that the two editors of the “Internationales Freimaurerlexikon”, E. Lenucoff and O. Posner, also take this view, in spite of the fact that “brothers” of far less significance and much maller reputation have found their way into their encyclopaedia.⁶ It is only Ju. M. Steklov, the author of a Marxist biography on Bakunin, who not only recognized his membership in the movement, but definitely stated that his contact with the Italian lodges amount to more than a short and transient episode in Bakunin’s life. Steklov could not support, however, this logical conclusion with archival sources and contemporary publications, other than the facts revealed by Nettlau.⁷

The roots and the beginnings of the contact

When may Bakunin have joined the freemasonic movement? By no means in the first period of his life, spent exclusively in Russia; almost certainly, his disposition towards freemasonry could not have come from his family or from friends. The Russian lodges had been banned three years before the suppression of Dekabristism — some had contributed to the diffusion of mysticism, but others had helped social progress. They had dissolved one after the other by the end of the 30s, i.e. by the time of Bakunin’s ideological maturation.⁸ In the following decades, the endeavours of the opposition took shape in entirely different organizations: friendly circles, social meetings, subsequently the “Cirill and Method Society” and the loose conspirative societies of the Petrashevists. The friendly circles of the “Westerner” intellectuals that Bakunin had belonged to before his journey to Germany in 1840 were no longer in direct contact with the masonic traditions of long decades of the Russian enlightenment. Many collaterals in the Bakunin family were members of lodges at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries; in their epistolar heritage, however, there is no mention made of either M. A. Bakunin or his close relatives — the Muravyovs, Poltorotskys, Bezobrazovs — having shown any interest towards to movement in the 1830s and ’40s.

Consequently, the contact is not, or not primarily, to be sought in his years spent in Russia and in what his parents or relatives could have told him, but in the first period of his life as an exile. There are no data, however, on his membership in German and Swiss lodges in the 1840s; even the suggestion that he was admitted to the lodge in Paris in 1845 is merely a hypothesis.

Nevertheless, a rapprochement to freemasonry was on the way in the middle of the 1840s. The well-known Polish masonologist L. Hass e.g. has proved that Poles who had become stateless on the morrow of the uprising in 1830 and ’31 joined the movement in large numbers. They partly worked in French lodges, but they also formed separate societies

outside their country; the same holds for Italian, German, and Spanish travellers and refugees who arrived in France around 1846.⁹

Within the small group counting a handful of Russian exiles, the same process took place. The Turgenev brothers took part in the activity of several European lodges in the 1820s and '30; Dekabrist N. I. Turgenev, sentenced to death in effigie, was deeply preoccupied with the ideas of Adam Weyshaupt,¹⁰ while his brother A. I. Turgenev, although officially not an emigrant, spent most of his life far away from St. Petersburg. From the next generation, I. G. Golovin and N. I. Sazonov — both standing close to the French republicans — had already been freemasons before the "spring of nations".¹¹ (At the same time, A. I. Herzen, the great fore-runner of Russian materialism, never was a member. Like other movements with mystical features, he could not come to terms with freemasonry, either.)

Even if he was officially admitted in 1845, Bakunin cannot be regarded freemason "in general" at this early period of his exile. As is well-known, there was a tendency all over Europe in the 1840s to join the movement, not only on the part of oppositionist petty bourgeois and intellectuals, but also on the part of other social layers, standing for other class interests. Thus we find among the newly admitted, members of the haute bourgeoisie — fighting deep crises politically and economically alike, but unwilling to change radically the social system — and of the aristocracy, as well as state officials, fiercely defending the "old regime" and taking firm measures against its enemies. As often as not, they tried to use the power of the lodges for their own ambitions or in favour of the government. Bakunin was not admitted here, but into one of the left-wing societies that professed the republican ideals of "liberty, equality, fraternity", having detached themselves from the official masonic trends in almost every European country by the 1840s. The first source attesting this is Bakunin's so far unmentioned note from 1848, which contains the name of the French lodge that accepted him: "Loge Orient de Paris".¹² Further, from the letter of Heliodor Skórzevski written on October 9th, 1848 — a Pole from Poznań who had an active role as a politician during the "spring of nations" — it comes to light that at the time Bakunin belonged to the masonic branch with Scottish rites, which was widespread among Polish exiles. He occupied a relatively low position in its hierarchy of 33 grades. According to Skórzevsky's letter, his membership may have made him easier, already during his journey round Europe in 1848, to get into contact with various national and social movements.¹³

Presumably, in his conspirative activity in 1848 and '49 — especially when in contact with the participants of the "May conspiracy" in Prague — Bakunin utilized what he had mastered in the illegal work of the lodges. In his epistolar heritage and in the confessions at court of his fellow-conspirators, however, nothing can be found as regards freemasonry; and of course Bakunin kept the secret of his membership both before the "Tsar of all Russians" and before the leaders of the secret police, i.e. the readers of the "Confession".

Re-joining left-wing freemasonry

As an exile in Siberia he cannot have been a member; consequently, the question arises then as follows: on returning to Europe, how and why did Bakunin re-establish his contacts with the left wing of the masonic movement in the 1860s, and, settling down in Italy in 1864, how could he reconcile his membership with the basic principles of the "Société", brought about to realize social transformations?

After his long years of imprisonment and exile, it was rather difficult for Bakunin to get accommodated to European standards. According to the unanimous claim of his contemporaries, he held unto his revolutionary resolve all through his exile in Siberia. During his forced "rest", however, he had not moved away from what he then called "general" democratic ideology, coming from the time before the revolutions in 1848, and possibly containing an adherence to the left wing of freemasonry.

After settling down in Western Europe, Bakunin primarily fought for the consistent realization of social reforms in Russia, the independence of Poland, as well as for setting to their own rights the nationalities living in Eastern Europe. This was both democratic ideology and concrete political program; and with its occasional manoeuvring and with its disposition towards compromises, once more it was in accordance with his participation in the masonic movement in Europe at the time. Besides, more radical "brothers" could always form separate lodges to join societies based on different principles, while keeping their membership at the traditional lodges. Some bourgeois historians, however, take a unilateral point of view when they singularly emphasize that the lodges — as units of organization — were points of contact between the antagonistic groups. This is only half-true; the opposite role of the lodges must also be taken into account, viz. that of polarization.

Apart from these characteristics, those mystical features must be sorted out of the freemasonry in the 1860s which, mainly in the closed communities of the exiles, had gained strength after the suppression of the revolutions in 1848 and had proved to be a cohesive force among the former warriors of the "spring of nations". Despite his revolutionary resolve, Bakunin did certainly fall under the influence of this tendency. Thus e.g. at the beginning of 1869, when he already called freemasonry "unnecessary and harmful" in the journal in Locle "*Le progrès*", he still considered it important to emphasize that the earlier phase of the movement was an organic part of the progressive heritage of world history. "It was a grandiose practical realization of the humanistic ideals of the 18th century," runs his dialectics intended for workmen readers. "All those great principles of liberty, equality, fraternity, and the human reason... which had been worked out theoretically in 18th century philosophy were turned, through the medium of freemasonry, into a practical domain — and the basis of new morals and new politics... Freemasonry became the leading spirit of the institution of destruction and re-creation... freemasonry, which... was

no more, and no less, than the conspiracy of the bourgeoisie against the tyranny of feudalism, monarchy, and God."¹⁴

Another essential point is the fact that it was not only in an ideological way that Bakunin the practising politician had contacts with the movement already at the time of the "spring of nations"; in realizing some of his ideas, he could well utilize the advantages of his membership in practice. It is a conspicuous fact that when he re-entered active political life in 1862 and '63, a considerable number of his associates of many nationalities were freemasons: the Italian A. Saffi, the Polish A. Giller and J. Demon-towicz, the Czech J. V. Frič, the Swedish A. Blanche and A. Sohlman and the French A. Talandier.

Considering the traditions of left-wing freemasonry after the "spring of nations", it can rightly be assumed that the use of its special secret sign system and the presentation of letters of recommendation must have made it easier for Bakunin, especially in their earlier phases, to establish whatever contacts he was in need of. Nevertheless, he must also have been aware of the heterogeneity of the political constitution of the movement and of the possible infiltration of indifferent persons — which occasionally caused him to separate his political and masonic activities.¹⁵

As we shall see, Bakunin regularly availed himself of his masonic connections during his travels at the turn of 1863 and '64. He may have done the same during his stay in Sweden in spring, 1863. Paradoxically enough, he was not only welcome by the radicals grouping around the journal "Aftonbladet". On the Scandinavian peninsula, he had to regard as his "brother" King Charles XV of Sweden as well. It was the tradition in Sweden that the king held the office of the Grand Master, and the majority of the head officials, who were managing the affairs of the country, also belonged to the lodge.¹⁶ Bakunin negotiated with the representatives of the Swedish ruling class as the advocate of anti-Tsarist aspirations, and this was the purpose of his talks with the king as well. All through his negotiations he preserved his political independence and his positions. The principle of "mutual aid", which was compulsory for the lodges, had little role in the problems Bakunin propounded; as for the talks themselves, they had no considerable result. Still, if Bakunin had not attained, by this time, the illustrious twenty-eighth grade, he would certainly have had difficulties in carrying on his negotiations in the traditionally masonic Scandinavian political life, and in arranging his great "triumphal march" in spring, initiated by his supporters from the radical parties.¹⁷

Thus to all appearances, in the first half of the 1860s, Bakunin regarded freemasonry — and mainly its left wing — not only as a movement continuing the progressive heritage of humanity and as an international organization with a rich store of conspirative devices at its disposal, but also as a device itself that he could put to use in order to achieve concrete political results. This holds even more for his relations with the Italian masonic movement, as it was extremely closely connected with what took place in the political life of that country in the middle of the 1860s.

The traditions of Italian freemasonry

The Italian lodges admitted "brother" Bakunin in January 1864; their redical traditions go back to the end of the 18th and, mainly, to the beginning of the 19th centuries. The numerous states and provinces of the divided country had, from the gebinning, a great many mystical lodges, uniting big landowners or rich patricians aspiring to power in town. Within these lodges, or in separation from them, the representatives of democratic principles had a great part in diffusing the illuminate theory and the conspirative tactics of Adam Weyshaupt, and in transplanting the ideas of the great French revolution onto Italian soil. At the time of the restoration, some well-known freemasons took part in establishing and working out the practice of the organizations of the Carbonaris, and in bringing about their contacts in Italy and abroad.¹⁸

In the 1830s and '40s the development of Italian freemasonry was uneven, and had a rather differentiated picture. It was primarily on national impulses that some Italian freemasons took part in the fights of the Risorgimento. They could reconcile perfectly well the acceptance of national ideology with the principle of "super-nationality" of their own movement; this could even take on, occasionally, — e.g. at the time of the "spring of nations" — the features of internationality. After the defeat of the revolutions, some masonic politicians who were forced into exile — e.g. L. Frapolli, G. Mazzoni, F. Dall'Ongaro — considered it extremely important to maintain a regular cooperation with the exiled "brothers", among them Hungarians, living abroad.¹⁹

On the Appennine peninsula, regular lodges were very rare between 1849 and '59, as they were fiercely prosecuted by the authorities of Austria, Naples and the Papal State. In 1859 and '60, however, which were decisive years for the Risorgimento, the state of affairs took a radically new turn. In Italy, more and more neophytes entered the masonic movement — which does not mean of course that each member of the lodges agreed with G. Garibaldi's ideas, or with those of G. Mazzini and the Action Party under his control (especially with his republican views concerning the unification of the country and its future system). Even in the 1850s there was a definite streaming e. g. in Piemont of the rich trading bourgeoisie, loyal to the dynasty of Savoy, of influential state officials, and of high ranking officers into the lodges; besides working for the fromation of a unified kingdom, they wished to submit the movement to the current interests of the ruling class in internal and external politics. The same process can be seen very clearly to have taken place in Sicily as well, where from 1860 onwards there was a fierce struggle within the lodges between the monarchists, standing close to Turin politically and in the movement alike, and the Garibaldist left wing. Thus the moderate leaders of the freemasons in Piemont were guided by expressedly political aims when they made efforts to unite their "brothers" on a nation-wide scale.²⁰

In the first half of the 1860s, it was those standing for the government party that first gained ground in the struggles between the various trends

of Italian freemasonry. At the general assembly on December 22nd, 1861 e.g., C. Nigra from the circle of Vittorio Emanuele II was elected Grand Master against G. Garibaldi. Another sign of the temporary prevalence of the loyalists was the fact that F. Cordova from Southern Italy, minister of justice and minister of economy of several cabinets, became the head of the "Grande Oriente Lodge" of Turin, which was a leading lodge nationally as well. During the mastership of C. Nigra the conflicts between the right and the left wing became even more strained and ended in open polemics.²¹

In August 1863, immediately before Bakunin's settling down in Italy, there was a fiery debate again at the national meeting of the freemasons in Florence, between the pro-Garibaldian side of the movement and the moderates. According to A. Luzio's evaluation, it was from a ritual aspect that the inner antagonisms between the orthodox and the neophyte trends came to the surface here. It can also be seen from the source-material, however, that, under the pretext of discussing the 3rd constitution it was, in a disguised form, the further objectives of the Risorgimento under debate.²² In Genoa at last, where the deputies of 136 communities had assembled in May 1865, the former opposition carried the day. It was on the initiative of the left wing that a pamphlet was issued condemning the assassination of "brother" Abraham Lincoln; this was open political demonstration.²³

There was a national shift to the left all through Italy. The main reasons for this were offered by the reactions of the people to the cyclical letter "Quanta Cura" of Pope Pius IX on December 8th 1864 and to the disreputable "Syllabus", causing a great uproar among many Catholics as well. Subsequently, the anticlerical groups also became alert.²⁴ This did not make an end, however, to the debates on power and ideology going on within the masonic movement, and often well reflecting the political situation in Italy.²⁵ This young state had, due to the belated expansion of capitalism, an underdeveloped economic structure; thus, before the labour movement grew more effective, in its political history left-wing freemasonry could serve as a basis and nation-wide constitutional framework for the aspirations of the Garibaldist and Mazzinist petty bourgeoisie and intelligentsia and, sometimes, even of manual labourers. The left wing of the masonic movement was not, however, transformed into a leftist party or group completely independent of the right wing anywhere in Italy until the end of the 1860s. Parallely with the strengthening of the labour movement, it had to lose more and more of its significance in Italian political life.

Life in the lodges of Florence in the middle of the 1860s

The confrontation of the two trends in Italian freemasonry can also be seen in the lodges of Tuscany, where Bakunin was admitted. At first, the activists of the "Concordia" — a lodge only partially founded by left-wing personalities in Florence in 1861 — attempted to reduce the activity

of the movement to organizing charity work and cultural performances. Although they had no definite program based on a progressive ideology, collecting contributions for the local workers' societies still was a positive trait in their activity. Some members of the lodge even insisted on the institution of public elementary schools and on the formation of a local people's bank. Due to the uncertainty of their ideological positions, all this amounted, however, to no more than a series of philanthropist deeds; and the workers to be supported were strictly kept away from the masonic elite.²⁶

As a reaction to the "Concordia's" growing withdrawal into moderation, another lodge was formed — or rather half-separated from the former lodges — in Florence in 1863, under the name "Il Progresso Sociale". This lodge belonged to the opposition and soon developed its posts at several other places in Tuscany. Among its leading figures and activists we find Dr B. Odicini, N. Lo Savio, A. Martinati, G. Dolfi, F. Bideschini, Ferenc Pulszky, F. Dall'Ongaro, C. Lunel and G. Mazzoni — the last being a leading figure in Florence and Prato as well.

Those gathering around the lodge — among them some leaders of the labour societies in Tuscany at the time — are of extreme interest for the historian of the radical movements in Italy. The list of the leaders can be perfectly reconstructed from a letter of credence made out for Gyula Tanárky.²⁷

The sessions of the "Il Progresso Sociale" were often held as friendly meetings or exclusive political negotiations. The official talks went on in extreme secrecy, thanks to the leftish character of the lodge. Even so, the police managed to obtain facts about the meetings of the most active members. Among others, the role of Ferenc Pulszky in the local masonic movement was discovered in this way.²⁸

The "Il Progresso Sociale" was the lodge that admitted Bakunin. It had several members who took part in, and even were leaders of, the long struggle for the unification of Italy. Thus it is easy to understand that between 1863 and '64 the activity of the lodge under their direction was based on a radical ideology, despite the heterogeneity of the local masonic movement. It is another problem, however, to what extent and with what results could these progressive politicians move freemasonry closer to the social movements with republican or socialist demands in Italy? Also, how much could N. Lo Savio separate his activity in the workers' movement, or G. Mazzoni his manifold conspirative, and G. Dolfi his republican activities from what they did, very intensively, for the masonic movement in Florence? Finally, how and on what basis could these personalities of remarkably different ideological dispositions maintain cooperation?

The answer to these questions may be hidden in a number of still latent documents and sources, e.g. those documents in the National Széchenyi Library and in the Hungarian National Archives which give an account of the everyday work of the masonic movement in Tuscany. Among them, the letters of L. Frapolli well illustrate the fact that the

correspondence between the lodges and between their leaders had the role of political information channels. As it were, they formed a network as quick and as complex as possible. Based upon the diary of Gyula Tanárky, such important moments in the history of Italian freemasonry can be reconstructed as e.g. the fact that, within a series of ritual readings, Dr B. Odicini — who was the head of the “Il Progresso Sociale” at the time — held a lecture on the principles of socialism in the middle of the 1860s.²⁹ Tanárky was witnessing and recording this influx, usually indirect, of progressive ideas.

His diary, so valuable for scholars who are often without appropriate source-material, also proves the hypothesis that the members newly admitted to the “Il Progresso Sociale” were allowed at first only to participate in the charity actions of the movement. This was one manifestation of the “principle of gradual initiation”, so much favoured by Bakunin.³⁰ The most influential members of the lodge — with Dr B. Odicini at their head — discussed the forthcoming tasks at the house of G. Dolfi and Ferenc Pulszky, alternatively. It was here that they had talks with their “brothers” travelling through, or stopping for a short stay in the town. One of the most significant such meetings was the one organized by Pulszky, a dinner on December 31, 1863, where all who would form Bakunin’s most interesting — masonic — environment in the ensuing months in Florence made their appearance: Dolfi, Lunel, Bettini, du Montel, Dall’Ongaro. We find almost the same figures among the most active republican politicians of the town.

The sources make no mention of the reason for the extremely strict exclusivity of the freemasonry — and especially of its left wing — in Tuscany. With the knowledge of their identity and their political habits, however, it is perhaps safe to say that, in all probability, it was not only a consistent adherence to the rituals that forced the members of the lodges into such secrecy, but also their endeavours — by no means legal — to form a *political group* opposing the church and the government.

It was not only at private talks or in the sessions of the lodges that left-wing freemasons exchanged their views. The Florentine journal — or as E. Conti put it, “giornaletto” — “Il Temporale” e.g. counted expressly as their organ.³¹ The heritage from the middle of the 1860s, mostly unpublished and full of ritual signs, of the progressive politicians of the left branch of Tuscan — and, generally, Italian — freemasonry is of great interest by no means only for the researcher of the anti-Catholic movements in Italy. The well-built and international network of masonic contacts made it possible for the Italian Garibaldists to obtain classified information — before it reached the government officials themselves! In order to realize certain political aims in Italy, these connections were put to use even in international agitation.³² This is the old European republican practice again; but at the time it was also characteristic of Bakunin’s tactics. According to the masonic traditions, this network of contacts was also a means for the members to deliver material aid to their “brothers” in the country and abroad. These — practically immeasurable — possibi-

lities provided by the movement must have contributed to the fact that Michail Bakunin took part more and more intensively in the activity of this progressive Florentine masonic lodge.

"Brother" Bakunin and the "Il Progresso Sociale"

Three phases can be distinguished in Bakunin's activity in the Italian masonic lodges:

1. Traditional participation in the movement. Ritual and political cooperation with the local leaders, especially in the lodges in the Arno-valley;

2. Attempts to reform freemasonry and, simultaneously, to make use of it as a means in the realization of his political aims in Florence and, even more, in Naples;

3. Estrangement from the movement; break-off; total confrontation.

At the beginning of the first phase (in January 1864), "brother" Bakunin arrived in Florence with a letter of credence from one of the most influential masonic politicians in Italy. *Lodovico Frapolli* had been a representative of the Republic of Lombardy in Paris in 1848 and '49, then volunteer in Garibaldi's army and minister of war in Modena. As a member of parliament, Frapolli mainly lived in Turin; often ready to enter into compromises, he was a characteristic representative of Italian republicanism. Far more moderate than Bakunin as he was in his ideas concerning the solution of social problems, his name was still a red rag to the conservatives.

His acquaintance with the Russian revolutionary arriving from Genova was obviously not incidental; they may well have got into contact through György Klapka or Karl Vogt.³³ Frapolli appointed on his part his old personal acquaintance and "brother" Ferenc Pulszky to initiate Bakunin — through the traditional rituals — into the lodge in Florence. In his letter Frapolli gives Bakunin's destination and the purpose of his settling down. It can also be seen from the letter that in 1863 Bakunin belonged to the masonic branch with Scottish rites as "Chevalier du Soleil", the possessor of the twenty-eighth grade. Presumably, it was very important for Frapolli, who had a great part in Bakunin's honorary membership in the Turin lodge, that the Russian revolutionary immediately join the work of the left-wing freemasonry in Florence — and in this phase of the history of progressive tendencies this also meant participation in the activity of the Italian opposition. Frapolli turned to Ferenc Pulszky ten days later in this matter again.³⁴ On the basis of the sources known before it could only be hypothesized that Bakunin was accepted (and even welcome) by the Italian masonic movement. The two letters cited, however, not only prove all this, but also record the fact that Bakunin enjoyed the assistance of the lodges at many other places where he stopped during his sojourn in Italy.

At this stage of his career it is impossible to separate both the objective manifestations of, and his subjective feelings about his belonging to the European democratic, and his participation in the left-wing masonic, movements. This is characteristic of his letters written in the first half of 1864, where Bakunin demanded that all the Italian and European democratic forces unite in the shortest possible time. In order to reach this end, he regarded freemasonry a useful instrument and a constitutional framework. Apart from (or just on account of) this, he did not hesitate to draw the attention to the necessity of polarization within the movement. For this a good opportunity was provided by A. Blanche's arrival on the Appennine peninsula with concrete political aims. Receiving this radical Swedish politician also involved serious ritual events. According to what Bakunin wrote to G. Garibaldi on March 18th, there was perfect harmony between the (topical) masonic and the (concrete) political aims of A. Blanche and his Italian hosts.

"I have spoken of you to my friend the Swedish patriot Auguste Blanche when he arrived in Florence, and he said he would be unable to return to his country without passing the respects of his fellow-countrymen to Garibaldi, the friend of the nations," Bakunin wrote in his letter, in many respects reflecting the terminology of 1848, and even of earlier, republicanism. "General, I deeply trust his benevolence. One of the most important leaders of the liberal democratic party, and the most popular person in Sweden, Norway, Denmark, i.e. all over Scandinavia... says that he has come to Italy only to shake hands with the great liberator, and even with me, whose hands, although they have liberated nobody, never refuse to serve the cause of liberty... I assured him that you will be glad to receive him and that he should visit you with his well-prepared plans — all the more so, as in your person all the European democracies, including the Swedish, are united. Blanche is a leading figure in freemasonry, and our friends in Florence will rise him at my request to the thirtieth grade, or even higher, so that he should have the right and the power to do in Scandinavia what you, General, are carrying out in Italy now. Thus he will give the sack to those within the masonic movement who are loyal to governing party, and replace them with democratic freemasonry."³⁵

Bakunin's masonic contacts in Tuscany in 1864 and his role in the "Il Progresso Sociale" would stand clearer to us if all the protocols of the sessions in all lodges at that period had been published. Without them, however, his role e.g. at the national masonic meeting in Florence in March 1864 cannot be elucidated yet. So far we do not know either, whether his office was honorary or factual — or whether he had any office in the local masonic movement. One thing is certain: he had great authority among his "brothers in the Arno-valley; a sign of this was that at his suggestion A. Blanche was risen in fact to the very high rank of "Chevalier Kadosh", mentioned in the letter. In hardly more than a year that he spent in Tuscany, Bakunin himself advanced four grades,³⁶ thus getting very near the magic thirty-third grade, possessed only by a handful of freemasons in each country in the middle of the 1860s.³⁷

In any way, Bakunin seems to have wished to keep his membership secret at the time: he makes no mention of it even in his writings under pseudonyms in 1864 and '65. Between the lines, however, it is easy to recognize ideas of masonic inspiration. Turning to his Swedish audience e.g. he writes that in the century "it was the French nobility who have taken charge of the philosophical and philanthropic ideas destined to change the world."³⁸ In the terminology of the age "philanthropic ideas" meant humanistic masonic principles. In another writing published in Italy, he avoided direct reference to freemasonry with the expression "the militant church of democracy". His description here corresponds in many respects to the ideal that he had put forth in one of his writings serving masonic directly purposes. "They form a church," he writes, "whose members are all poor and unknown, and occupy very modest places in the hierarchy of the present society. They do not wish to be risen higher merely for their own sakes. They are exempt from individual activity. Their only interests lie in the right and the dignity of the majority, in democracy, and in the people. The only power of these men is their reason aspiring straightly for truth, and this reason... is serious and pure: refusing all the effeminacy of, and all the conciliation offered by falsehood, all the transcendental conceptions of romanticism, metaphysics and theology, it finds joy, liberty and its own place in sheer verity. Such is their passion for truth, and such is their glowing faith in mankind. This unlimited enthusiasm makes them heroes without speeches and without sacrifice. Such is their mutual love, this deep and close cooperation, which took its birth from the union of their faith, passion and aims, and which, in a world so contradictory to them, professes that the individual is for all and all are for the individual."³⁹

He omitted the term "freemasonry", not only from his writings intended for the public, but also from those connected with conspirative activity, e.g. from the program of the "Société". "...purely in the professional sense, he compared the work of the international brotherhood with that of the Jesuits, instead of mentioning the much more suitable counterpart freemasonry", as L. Krusius-Ahrenberg put it.⁴⁰ But this Swedish scholar does not mention how many details and expressions of masonic motivation can be found in the work he touches upon. Straight reference to the masonic movement, however, could have hindered the admittance of outsiders, and would have brought into debate the unique character and the originality of the "Société". Thus what we can do at the most is resort only to indirect proofs in comparing Bakunin's conspirative organization with freemasonry. That this comparison is possible is also admitted by the cited author. "Bakunin's reorganizing and revising his own ideology may have taken place, in spring or summer 1864; and this was also the time when he was in vigorous contact — himself being a freemason — with the anticlerical masonic organizations of Tuscany, and he wove this atheism into his politico-philosophical system."⁴¹

Masonic motives in the anticlericalism of Bakunin

On the basis of the data at our disposal, A. Luzio's opinion seems acceptable — although he does not refer to exact sources —, mentioning Bakunin among the first members of the Tuscan lodge.⁴² It was in surpassing the left wing both in ideology and in matters of organization that Bakunin reached the top of his masonic "career". At the turn of 1864 and '65 he began to find insufficient the range of possibilities provided by the rules of the organization. As he gradually dispensed with the remnants of his "general" democratic ideology, he was more and more sceptical about the lectures he could hear in the sessions of the lodges, exalting the omnipotent power of humanity in an abstract and often autotelic sense. His writings in 1864 and '65, however — published⁴³ or in manuscript⁴⁴ — do not lack in the traditional themes and the phraseology of the movement — especially at the elaboration of anti-theological ideas.

The anti-theologism of Bakunin was not motivated exclusively by freemasonry. His criticism of religions was influenced by left-wing Hegelianism and especially by Feuerbach's philosophy.⁴⁵ It would be unilateral to take the masonic influence as absolute here; in literature, however, we often find the opposite error. Scholars often leave out of consideration the fact that in their ideologies such prominent figures of the history of pre-Marxist socialism and anarchism as P. J. Proudhon and Bakunin finally shaped their relations to religion after their acquaintance with freemasonry. Even the Polish scholar *H. Temkinowa* fails to refer to this fact in her writings on Bakunin's atheism and theory of liberation, although the roots of Bakunin's philosophy of religion are to be found, not in the least, in his accepting and subsequent surpassing of the progressive traditions of freemasonry.⁴⁶

"We hold that all the religions of the past and the present have been discoveries at each stage of history, and that they are historically necessary, not for God, but for Humanity, for human reason and mind", Bakunin the active freemason wrote in the program document of the "Société" in autumn 1864.⁴⁷ "The history of religions... is nothing else than the development of the collective reason and consciousness of humanity," was the idea developed in his work "The Knute-German Empire and Social Revolution", which appeared in 1871 as the completion of his anarchist theology. By this time he had broken with freemasonry, but — as can well be illustrated by a number of examples — he had taken over some of the ideas and tropes of the movement.⁴⁸

His anti-theologism of masonic motivation goes beyond the criticism of Catholicism. "Man is independent in his relations to his fellow-creatures, and he is the slave of God" he summed up e.g. his views on the protestant religion in the above mentioned document of the "Société".⁴⁹ Some months later he gave a developed and aphoristic version of the same thought in his work "The Catechism of Freemasonry": "God exists, therefore man is a slave... Man is free, therefore there is no God. I wonder how anyone can find the way out of this circle."⁵⁰ From his struggle with the masonic

ideology for an atheism of a new kind came out the following famous "Bakuninian" saying — an axiom of anarchism: "If God exists, man is a slave. But an may, and must, be free. Consequently God deos not exist."⁵¹

It would require another study to examine how deeply this anarchistic and anti-theological conception was rooted in freemasonry,⁵² as an ideological conception that came to the foreground in the labour movements in Western Europe, especially in Italy and Switzerland, at the turn of the 1870s, and had an unproportionally large place in the class struggle of the proletariat. (The classics of Marxism took note of this tendency in time and began to fight it — concentrating especially on its anti-theologism.)

His anticlericalism became prominent in the Italian period of Bakunin's ideological development, i.e. when he was an active freemason. Earlier, when he represented pro-Polish and "democratic" pan-Slavism, this trend was hardly, or not at all, present in his program. During his activity of Russian concern he raised his voice against official Pravoslavism, and not against the faith itself. Even in his period of mature anarchism, he warned those young men who felt it was their vocation to go among the people against an exaggerated emphasis on atheistic propaganda: "...whenever we have to speak with the people of religion, we think it our duty entirely to give voice to our feithlessness — furthermore, to our hostility to religion — before them. But... the poeple is no doctrinaire and no philosopher. They do not have time for, and are not used to dealing with more than one problem at a time. If they are carried away with one, they forget about all the rest. Therefore it is our immediate duty to present the main problem to them — on whose solution, more than on the solution of any other, the liberation of the people depends. This problem can be seen from their circumstances and from their whole life; this is the economic-political problem. It is economic, as it means social revolution, and political, being the destruction of the state. Committing the poeple to the religious question means drawing them away from its real task, and betraying their cause."⁵³

This tactical scheme is diametrically opposed to the anticlericalism that we find in Bakunin's writings of Western European concern. Here he stops at criticizing the hierarchy of the clergy, of religion, and whenever it is possible he usually avoids the problem as a whole. It is out of tactical reasons that he professes patience to his disciples; he declares that the religiosity of the Russian people will weaken, and at last disappear, with the victory of the social revolution and the subsequent elimination of the state. In contrast to this, he saw in the Western churches, and mainly in Catholicism, the fundament of social injustice and a factor that, even independently from the state, was hindering and slowing down the struggle of the working people.

Conflicts coming to the surface; reform endeavours in Florence and in Naples

Although Bakunin was on common ground with the Italian freemasons in his consistent criticism of the Catholic church, his gradual separation from the movement already can be felt in his relation to religion. While after 1864 the members of the Tuscan lodge were mostly deists or moderate, and not bigoted, Catholics, and less frequently protestant believers, it was also in the middle of the 1860s that a *militant* atheism — which Bakunin called “a new kind of religion” — became conclusively the cornerstone of the ideology and political doctrine of the Russian revolutionary.

He took great efforts to persuade his freemason “brothers” in Florence to revise their disposition, in his opinion too patient, towards religion. Presumably it was after the issuing of the Papal “Syllabus” in 1865 that he put down his ideas upon which he wanted to base a sessional lecture. Here we find the following theses: “The huge difference between them (the freemasons — M. K.) and the religious institutions lies exclusively in the spirit in which the F. M.’s on one hand, and the Christian organizations on the other, spread and diffuse their doctrines and their assistance. The absolute and the ultimate aim of the latter is, much rather than to relieve mankind of suffering, the glorification of God, the victory of the religious spirit, the breaking of man into the divine yoke and, consequently, into the yoke of the Church and of all power sanctioned by it. What follows necessarily from this is the decline and the sacrifice of human will and reason, the denial of all liberty, which lead directly to slavery”.

“Freemasonry must, on the contrary, if it is to be constant to its original and primary principles, strive for the entire liberation of man, the creation of humanity through liberty, upon the ruins of all power!”⁵⁴

That Bakunin not only mastered the masonic formulas and symbols but also used them can be seen from the following ritual forms (which he filled with new contents):

“And now let us choose:

Masonic symbol:

Reason
Liberty-Equality-Solidarity-Justice
Reason-Revelation
Work-Mercy
Justice-Grace
Reason-Work-Justice
Liberty-Equality-Solidarity

Theological symbol:

Revelation
Slavery-Privilege-Egoism-Grace
Liberty-Slavery
Equality-Privilege
Solidarity-Tyranny-Despotism
Revelation-Mercy-Grace
Power-Privilege-Egoism.”⁵⁵

In this manuscript Bakunin practically suggested compulsory measures against monotheism and the ceremonies of the church; these measures were to form an important part of the international metamorphosis that he professed exactly in the years 1864 and '65.⁵⁶ All this was impossible to accomplish without a revolution involving a simultaneous seizing of

political power. We may rightfully assume that by expounding these ideas the Russian revolutionary wished to stimulate the political activity of his "brothers" in Florence. The origins of the anti-religious ideas of his later works of a more mature anarchist ideological position can thus be traced back to his sessional lectures, which have come down to us in manuscript form.

If, after M. Nettlau, we accept that the cited sentences date from 1865, then it is also very likely that already in the Arno-valley — like in Southern Italy from autumn 1865 onwards — Bakunin made attempts towards an ideological reformation of the Italian masonic movement. This time his point of departure was realistic. Exactly at the turn of 1864 and '65, the aversion of many freemasons towards Catholicism (and the authorities under its thumb) grew stronger — especially after the stubborn adherence of the Papacy to the independence of their State, the issuing of the "Syllabus" and the "Quanta Cura", etc. All through Italy, materialism and free-thinking, starting many on the way to atheism, spread in wider and wider circles.⁵⁷ All this provided a favourable background for Bakunin's reform attempts; besides, he may have been helped by the ever sharpening polarization within the masonic movement, which had earlier led, e.g. in Florence, to schisms within the lodges and to the foundation of new communities.

However, Bakunin's endeavours to reform freemasonry had little success in 1864 and '65. With the collaboration of a number of well-known local freemasons, he had been able to found the local "families" of the "Société" but he failed to draw up such forces in Tuscany as would have helped him realize, on a nation-wide scale, the much-urged reformation of the Italian freemasonry.

When he moved to Naples in autumn 1865, Bakunin became influential in the "Vita Nuova" lodge.⁵⁸ But this would not be sufficient for him. As his good acquaintance *A. Tucci* remembered, he already attempted to found a separate lodge in Naples.⁵⁹ It is evident that in this case he regarded the masonic lodge not only as a would-be basic unit for the reformed movement, but also as an already existent framework for a constitutional form suitable for the practical realization of his conspirative-revolutionary ideology, set forth in the program of the "Société". He could not have found an organization more significant and well-formed in its dimensions and range of power in Italy than this, in order internationally to realize his "social reorganization" and to transform conspirative tactics into a real program of action. During his work he thought at first that the ideological and constitutional transformation of a lodge would be easier than, say, an ex nihilo creation of the "families of the Société" in Florence or in Naples. Not only here did he apply this tactics; he wanted to impose his own ideology upon the organization, already in existence and with much authority, of the general staff of the "League of Peace and Liberty" in 1867 and '68, and upon that of the International Workmen's Association from 1868 onwards, in order to pave the way for the spread of his own ideas.)

As the activity of Bakunin the "general" democrat had gone side by side with his participation in freemasonry, he did not break overnight with the lodges either, on the morrow of his forming the "Société" — an organization with a much more radical ideology in social matters. Among the first members of the "Société" we find a number of freemasons (let it suffice to mention here the names of the Italian G. Dolfi, C. Lunel, G. Mazzoni, the French A. Talandier, and the Swedish A. Sohlman). Besides, the text and the terminology of the program document of the "Société" in 1864 are in many places almost identical with the phraseology of freemasonry.

The confrontation of masonic principles and social objectives

In the first chapter of the program document, entitled "The Objectives of the Society", Bakunin gave a summary of the duties of the members: "The purpose of the given Society is to unite the revolutionary elements in all countries, against the Holy Alliance of all the tyrants of Europe: it is a union against the tyrant of religion, politics, bureaucracy and finance." This order of the terms is not incidental. Contrarily to Marx and Engels, Bakunin, mainly out of masonic motivation, laid primary stress on anti-theologism in his ideology. This is reflected in the second chapter of the document, where the author elucidates to his readers the principles of the French encyclopedists (and freemasons) at the end of the 18th century. Besides, he points out that society has neglected the rational education of the youth, although, as he writes, it would have an immeasurably positive effect, as people are good and honest from their birth. Here Bakunin repeats, almost word by word, the well-known thesis of the French "brothers": "the world . . . is divided into two systems which are entirely opposed to one another; they are built upon the principles of theology and authority on one side, and humanism and liberty on the other."⁶⁰

These ideas of masonic inspiration are perhaps even more definite and manifest in the yet unpublished "Code of Rules", garde in the Archive of Manuscripts of the Royal Library in Stockholm, and in the "Revolutionary Catechism", dating 1866 and coming from a more advanced phase of Bakunin's ideology. There is a virtual contradiction in the latter document. In the period in question, Bakunin had already been disappointed, ideologically, in the Italian freemasonry. At the same time, when he turned to his disciples, mostly freemasons, forming the kernel of the "Société" in Naples, he used a traditionally republican and characteristically masonic terminology (which they were used to).⁶¹ Beyond the formal side of the matter, Bakunin consciously insisted — even in more developed phases of his "social" ideology — on giving primacy to anti-theologism. This is a remnant of his masonic past. The introduction of the paragraph "The Objectives of the Society" is, with lesser modifications, identical with the cited part of the former program document. Here again, the author demands the annihilation of the "religious, political,

economic and social" organizations and the formulation of an all-European society based upon "liberty, reason, justice and work", which would subsequently spread all over the world.⁶² In the first two points of the next part of the "Catechism" Bakunin adjusted the traditional masonic principles to his own revolutionary tactics, leaning upon what he had written in the above mentioned masonic manuscript from the year 1865.

"1. We deny the presence of a real, personal God, comprehending the whole world, consequently all his revelations, and all divine intervention into the matters of the world and of man. The service of God and his cult are to be abolished."

"2. Replacing the cult of God with the respect and love of man, we profess human reason to be the sole criterion of justice, human honour the basis of justness, individual and collective liberty the only creator of order among mankind."⁶³

As regards the structure of the "Société" and the system of its activity, the masonic membership of Bakunin and that of most of the founding "brothers" deserves even more attention than their role in the formation of the ideology of the society. Naturally, it is difficult exactly to define everywhere, whether a detail of the text of the first Code of Rules was inspired by masonic or "simply" by conspirative-republican traditions. In his Italian environment, Bakunin may even have got acquainted with, and mastered, the conspirative methods of the Carbonaris, the Italian Buonarrotists and the Mazzinists through a masonic mediation. At the same time, he may have studied the structure of freemasonry, which had greatly influenced almost all the illegal movements on the Appennine peninsula, through the personalities belonging to, or once in connection with these trends. At any rate, the paragraph in the "Revolutionary Catechism" in 1866 dealing with the function of the "Frère International avec mission provisoire spéciale" could not have been taken over from the practice of contemporary republican movements. (Besides, this is a specially masonic term.)⁶⁴

We have only a moderate amount of sources about the first months of the activity of the Société. It is easy to see, however, that the society took its basic principles in more than one respect from the traditions and methods of freemasonry. This is shown e.g. by the fact that in February 1865 G. Mazzoni, one of the most respected Italian freemasons, on the instructions of the organization put a series of questions to neophyte A. de Gubernatis — imitating almost in every detail the masonic entrance examination — in order to reveal the ideological aptitude of the latter, in the house of the also well-known "brother" G. Dolfi.⁶⁵

The division of the brothers of the "Société" into "honorary" and "active", "national" and "international" brothers also comes from masonic traditions. So do such statements of Bakunin as "it is absolutely necessary that we form one family".⁶⁶ The "Code of Rules" of the society, as well as the "Revolutionary Catechism", compel each member to provide material support, and moral and political protection for one another. Regardless

of their sympathies, they were obliged to assist the members of the brotherhood in their official careers as well. They had to know the signs of the movement, and ruthlessly strike down on the traitors. These items are connected, immediately or indirectly, with the traditions of freemasonry.⁶⁷ Even the punishment of the renegates cannot only be derived from the rules of the republican conspirators; it is at the same time characteristic of the branch with Scottish rites of the masonic movement, where Bakunin himself belonged for nearly two decades.⁶⁸

Naturally, a number of ideas here cannot be found in any masonic documents; they are uniquely characteristic of Bakunin's own writings. Such are the gradual refusal of the state and of private property, and the "social reorganization" of the whole world — all this, for the time being, Bakunin intended for the far future. He usually inserted these theoretical statements into the parts touching upon the masonic constitution. On the whole, however, in this period — i.e. to the end of 1866 — parallels, points of contact and, occasionally, entire identity subsisted between Bakunin's new ideology and left-wing masonic ideas, and also between the structure of his "Société" and the generally accepted international structure of the lodges (of course incommensurable with the dimensions of the former). All through Bakunin's organizing activity, there can be felt his... past, hindering his further progress. All his plans, all his ideas about organization are rooted in the secret societies of the first half of the 19th century, in the constitutional rules of the masonic lodges and the Italian Carbonaris..., "— as V. Polonsky wrote on this phase of Bakunin's career.⁶⁹

Now the question arises, how, in Bakunin's ideology, the international and "supranational" principles of the masonic constitution were transformed into an unambiguously international "system of brotherhood"; and, not in the last place with the help of this, how he gradually surpassed the objectives of the national liberation movements and, among them, those of his "democratic" pan-Slavism (which latter he had professed between 1848 and '63).

The sources so far at our disposal are as follows: Bakunin's writings between 1864 and 1866; his epistolar heritage; and, in the first place, the documents of the "Société". All these seem to show that, after an analysis of social problems, Bakunin was led to an indirect representation of the working class (or, as he wrote for the time being with an obscure class content, of "manual labourers"). He paid less attention to the specially national problems of a given historical region, but turned the rest of his zeal towards the criticism of the Catholic religion and the reformation of freemasonry — i.e. towards problems of universal concern again. This shift of emphasis also had qualitative effects: by the end of 1864, the former ideas of "democratic" pan-Slavism and national liberation had almost completely disappeared from his writings; even his terminology had changed.

At this turning point of Bakunin's ideological development, the social factors and those connected with the labour movement are at least as

important as his left-wing masonic motivation. Be it as it may, if not with masonic contents, it was primarily on a masonic pattern that he brought about his "Société". The main objective reason for this was the fact that he began to organize the society when, in the 1850s, the international republican societies, still faultlessly functioning in Great Britain, were disintegrating one after the other, and the powers of the opposition on the continent did not possess an international organization that could have served as an example. True, with the cooperation of G. Garibaldi some Italian, German, Swiss and Belgian politicians did make several suggestions between 1859 and '64, for the formation of an international organization, or at least pointed out the necessity of it.⁷⁰ Such attempts were e.g. the secret conferences in La Chaux-de-Fonds on July 20th, and in Brussels between September 26th and 28th, 1863, which were prepared, among others, by I. Ph. Becker and P. Coullery. But they were the isolated achievements of some small conspirative parties that could not provide the pattern for an international conspirative organization.⁷¹

The well-known gradual construction of freemasonry — consisting, as we have seen, of 33 grades — as well as the activity of the autonomous and privileged lodges comprising exclusively influential head-officials may have thus given Bakunin the idea to categorize the members of his conspirative society into international and national "brothers". The former were to represent the movement in Europe, or even the world over, while the latter worked only within the boundaries of a national or geographical region. Directly and indirectly, the national brothers were in every respect subordinated to the international ones. According to Bakunin's design, the brothers delegated by the latter into the Central Directory were to form the general staff of the "Société".⁷²

In this society directed by the international "brothers", there could be no place for national principles. Bakunin always feared that some "families" coming from exclusively one national community would submit the organization to local aims and thus the social and universally humanistic objectives laid down in the covenants would be thrust into the background. Besides its favourable effects, the hierarchical organization was in direct contradiction with the principle of federalism, also laid down in the statutes. This point was an intersection of Proudhonic and Buonarrotist, federalist and centralistic republican conspirative principles.

"Underground Masonry" and the formation of the International Workmen's Association

After his first joining the International Workmen's Association (November 1864), Bakunin remained an active freemason for at least a year and a half, or two years — which well illustrates the fact that his path towards the labour movement, which had had detours and blind alleys earlier as well, was also contradictory in the period in question. He spent much of his time — which he could have devoted to the actions of

the European working class and to organizing the proletariat in Tuscany and, later, in Naples — attending masonic meetings. Viewed solely from this aspect, freemasonry could only have been a hindrance to him.

By no means was he, however, the only prominent representative of the European labour movement with a masonic past. In the closest environment of Marx, the names of the French Ch. Longuet, the Russian N. E. Utin or the Swiss-German J. Ph. Becker seem to be the best examples. Similarly to Bakunin, they had established their contacts with the masonic left wing already in the revolutionary-democratic and radical phases of their careers. Their membership cannot be said to have pushed them forward on their careers in the labour movement, but it did not hinder them essentially, either.⁷³

Unlike them the conspirative masonic traditions did have a harmful influence on some French founders of the International. That this did not effect the working class movement in the long run was owing to the determination of Marx; on the morrow of the formation of the International he was careful that the positions of the immediate representatives of the interests of the proletariat be firmly established on the levels of ideology and organization alike.⁷⁴

There is ample literature in the conflicts between some French members — and some Italians supporting them — of the first leading body of the Association and the wing led by Marx. Some studies tend to exaggerate the role of the masonic past of Marx's adversaries in the conflicts, and some entirely neglect this factor. The problem of the masonic moment in the polarization in the heroic age of the International is worth considering, as it may also contribute to seeing the contacts of Bakunin and left-wing freemasonry in the larger context of the revolutionary movements of the age.

Unable to bring about a unified organization, the group of French exiles — and mainly its left wing formed by one-time insurgents of the uprising in Paris in July 1848 — was famous for their masonic sympathies. Occasionally the national unity, so often lacking in the sessions of the lodges, did come about among French speaking members; at other times, the masonic framework led to the separation of the left wing. The official principals of the movement who, in the period between the "spring of nations" and the Commune in Paris, stood for the interests of the Second Empire in France and for those of the aristocracy and the haute bourgeoisie in Britain, did not cease to be "brothers".⁷⁵ It was no happenstance, however, that it was in the Loge des Philadelphes of the English *Order of Memphis* that the French freemasons (who had escaped from the continent) wished to gain admittance. Never recognized by official freemasonry, this lodge belonged to the left-wing republican movements of the age — with the apt expression of B. Nikolaevskij, to the European "Underground Masonry".⁷⁶

The French emigrants in Britain attempted to assimilate its objectives to those of the "spring of nations", and to reform this community of an originally mystical disposition. In the middle of the 1850s (at the time

of Bakunin's exile in Siberia), the leading members of the Supreme Council of the "Loge des Philadelphes" were former Jacobinic members of the National Assembly in 1848 and '49, free-thinkers standing close to the English journals "The Renssencer" and "The Free Thinker", and some young republicans who thought conspiracy the best tactics against the Buonapartist regime. There were two French centres of the lodge: one in London, and one on Jersey Island. Failing as they did to form a unified group (owing to the political and social heterogeneity of the French emigrants), the Philadelphians greatly contributed to the advancement of all-European democracy. Although rather individually than as an organization, they collaborated with the neo-Jacobinic community of emigrants called "La Commune Révolutionnaire" — of which later many became members of the leading body of the Commune in Paris. Also, together with some English, German and Polish politicians with a European orientation, they participated in the "International Association". This significant forerunner of the International Workmen's Association united within itself republican conspirative traditions and the legal ones of the labour movement.⁷⁷

Already from the middle of the 1850s, the "Loge des Philadelphes" represented a transitory stage between the traditional masonic constitutional unit and a definitely socialistic and conspirative organization. Its ideology was essentially eclectic, abounding in contradictory moments, from atheism to deism, from egalitarianism to free trade and a more modern version of capitalism. Immediately before the foundation of the International, many members of the masonic lodges were still committed — partly emotionally, partly consciously — to French republican traditions. They professed many kinds of conspirative tactics — including the terror acts of individuals, which Bakunin neither then nor later agreed with. Paolo Tibaldi was one of them, who spent some years in Cayenne and who the originator of an unsuccessful attempt at the life of Napoleon III.⁷⁸

Mixed with traditional elements and perhaps even more radical than left-wing freemasonry, Philadelphianism, as a factor of ideology, was of lesser importance at the time of the formation of the 1st International. Even in practical matters, e. g. in calling together the mass-meeting at St. Martin's Hall, their role was not as great as they later claimed. This meeting was an important step, but neither the first nor the last one, in a longer process. Truly, neither Marx nor Engels were among its organizers. It was not incidental, however, that the organizing committee, perhaps unaware of the dimensions of the movement they were to initiate, requested Marx to be present at the meeting, and later, to take part in working out the covenants. It was exactly their past that prevented the Philadelphians from being, even locally, the real initiators of such a movement.

At any rate, the workers' associations in Britain and in France wished to establish overt, and not conspirative, contacts between one another at the time.⁷⁹ Thus we cannot share the views of B. I. Nikolaevskij, in

whose opinion "the organizing traditions, which were kept by the Philadelphians, but... lacking in the workers' associations, enabled the former to provide the workers' associations in Britain and in France with technical support between 1862 and '64".⁸⁰ This view of the author the role of Philadelphianism as a movement, and of the lodge as a unit of organization in the formation of the International can be debated all the more, as the English proletariat had already had much experience with international contacts by the end of the first third of the century, and especially by the 1840s.⁸¹ Furthermore, the contacts between English and French organized workers were renewed during the world exhibition in London, and contained the elements of organized cooperation. Even without the mediation of the Philadelphians, this alliance, if somewhat later, would necessarily have come about.⁸²

The idea of the formation of the International Workmen's Association was not shared by every Philadelphian community. In 1864 e.g. "*La Commune Révolutionnaire*", whose members were mostly Philadelphians, and the group led by Louis Blanc remained outside of it. Thus we can speak of the participation of some Philadelphians only. Mutatis mutandis, it was similar to Bakunin's recruiting members for the "Société" in Florence: it was also some left-wing freemasons who entered the society in 1864 and '65, and not the whole "Il Progresso Sociale".

It is beyond doubt, however, that even though the French "Underground Masonry" did not participate as a whole body in the formation of the international, some influential and active members of it did have a principal role in its foundation and in the first period of its activity. Victor Le Lubez is a good example; he was a talented representative of the "Loge des Philadelphes", and a teacher of French and music. "*Le Lubez* is a young Frenchman... but he grew up on Jersey Island and in London, his English is excellent, and he is an extremely good mediator between French and English workmen," runs Marx's letter to Engels, which is of great source value. (The italics are Marx's — M. K.)⁸³

The Philadelphian V. Le Lubez was the member of the Sub-Committee from October 5th, 1864, then of the Central Council (later Supreme Council), and subsequently became the French corresponding secretary of the International. In this function he actively participated in the corporate meetings, in the mass meetings, and in the visits between 1864 and '66 made at several workers' societies in Britain in order to increase the number of the members of the International.⁸⁴ Out of his "brothers" at the lodge A. Talandier was, among others, elected into the Central Council of the International. He was a theoretician of the copperative movement and had attacked, from the left, already at the beginning of the 1850s, the emigrants' group in Britain headed by Kossuth, Mazzini, and Ledru-Rollin; he had demanded that the emigrant politicians set up a more definitely democratic and social program. Founding members of the Central Council were the teacher J. B. Boquet who, together with Talandier, had belonged for a long time to the political and friendly environment of A. I. Herzen; the printworker J. Leroux, the brother

of Pierre Leroux; the well-known French Utopian socialist, the one-time editor of the Proudhonist journal "*La Voix du Peuple*" *L. Vassbenter*; and the well-known French petty bourgeois democrat *J. Denoal*, who was politically very close to *V. Le Lubez*.

Most of the non-English members of the Central Council were elected upon the suggestion, or with the support, of *V. Le Lubez* in November and December 1864. (In the practice of the International, the form of the coopting itself was taken over, not from the masonic, but from the Chartist movement.) This was how the freemasons *F. Rybczynski* and *E. Holtorp* got into the Central council; the latter became the first corresponding secretary of the International in Poland.⁸⁵ This is characteristic of masonic tactics; they tried to obtain for their own people the leading posts of the institutions, organizations and societies important for them. But *V. Le Lubez* may also have been led by an even more immediate purpose, when he made alliance with *L. Wolff*, the confidant of *G. Mazzini*, and the first corresponding secretary of the International in Italy. Could he possibly have attempted, already in November 1864, to set up a block of French petty bourgeois revolutionaries, Italian Mazzinists and Polish emigrant freemasons within the Central Council?⁸⁶

Even though this is only a hypothesis, at the time of the formation of the International their membership in the "*Loge des Philadelphes*" certainly had a role in the political activity of *V. Le Lubez* and his circle of friends. Remembering later the role of mediation that he fulfilled between the French and the English workers in the formation of the International, *Le Lubez* wrote: "He said to himself: 'Denoal and *Lubez* live in London, and the latter must know free-thinking democrats; he speaks both languages, and as a freemason he must also know some 'brothers' of other nationalities; I am travelling to London.'"⁸⁷ In fact, in 1864 and '65 the French Philadelphians had an activity very similar to *Bakunin's* travels and recruitments with the help of the freemasons in 1863 and '64. The result of this activity, however, cannot by far be compared to the preparations of the meeting on September 28th.

Before spring 1865, there had been no confrontation yet in the sessions of the Central Council between *V. Le Lubez*, the rest of the Philadelphians who had got into the principal organs of the International, and *Marx*. It was conspicuous though, that during the elaboration and the composition of the text of the covenants of the International *V. Le Lubez* collaborated with the Mazzinist *L. Wolff*; but *Marx* saw to it that the Foundation Message of the International Workmen's Association be composed in accordance with the special and basic interests of the working class. He also revised the Provisional Code of Rules, grandiloquently written by *V. Le Lubez*. Due to the compromise, some expressions of petty bourgeois origin and Philadelphian disposition had found their way into the document — e.g. "there is no right without duty, and no duty without right".⁸⁸ (Characteristically, it was this thesis that rose the enthusiasm of some petty bourgeois socialists and Russian emigrants, theoretically close to Marxism, when they joined the 1st International in the middle or at

the end of the 1860s.) This detail did not change, however, the class view-point of the whole document, which was that of the proletariat. Marx composed it in such a way that, as he wrote to Engels on November 4th, 1864, "it will do no harm".⁸⁹

In this early conflict, Marx managed primarily to displace the Mazzinist ideas. Apart from this, he had to fight the "diffuse... French socialism",⁹⁰ and indirectly Philadelphianism as well. He considered it yet untimely overtly to break with them: in regular work he still wished to cooperate with V. Le Lubez and his "brothers" at the lodge. As for the latter, however, they must have realized that the International provided no appropriate framework for their own ideas after spring 1865, when the organization had got closer, both in contents and in form, to the original objectives of its Foundation Message.

It was not overnight, however, that the conflict broke out.⁹¹ At first, the French members of the International living in London seemed to be rightful in criticizing the Proudhonist leaders of the Section in Paris, for their sectarian behaviour. The latter e.g. regarded the physical workers as the exclusive representatives of the cause of the working class; according to this conception, even Marx would ultimately have had to leave the board of leaders of the International. However, disagreeing with this, Le Lubez and his followers, instead of bringing the issue to a realistic debate, provoked an open conflict. In the sessions of the Central Council, they supported, against the leaders in Paris, a characteristically class-alien politician, their above mentioned "brother" A. Lefort, who tried to tie his own interests to the rising star of the International.⁹² However, the problem is not so simple. The group led by Le Lubez and Lefort was opposed to the French leaders in a number of questions of ideology. Besides, they repeatedly gave support to L. Wolff against Marx and his followers; and as a bourgeois democratic Mazzinist, Wolff seriously endangered the proletariat character of the organization. At last, between December 1865 and March 1866, some Philadelphians headed by Le Lubez brought out in the press an event concerning the internal affairs of the organization: *P. Vésinier's* attack against Marx and the workmen's sections of the International in Paris.⁹³

The background for such views of some French members of the International was provided, besides their common petty bourgeois ideological — and, among others, left-wing masonic — dispositions, by the common basis of cooperation: the Philadelphian system of lodges. "...Lubez is conspiring with his brothers at the lodge..." Marx remarked concerning the issue in his notes on the conflicts within the section in Paris between March 16th and 18th.⁹⁴ In this itinerary, intended for *H. Jung*, the corresponding secretary of the International in France, Marx summed up the dangers that the behaviour of the group headed by Lefort and Le Lubez could have held for the association, and revealed its petty bourgeois roots: "Endangering the international character of the association and the rights of the Council: a) appointing deputies, b) the class character of the movement. Republican-formalists."⁹⁵

Between March, 1865 and April, 1866, Marx and the members of the Central Council supporting him managed finally to shatter the positions of the French petty bourgeois democrats. Soon they drove out of the leading body several representatives of the group under the influence of V. Le Lubez; some resigned from their posts and some gave up their incessant criticism. Interestingly enough, during the debate, the masonic membership of the French politicians was not brought to issue. However, as we have seen, the Marxists in the Central Council were well aware of the fact that the Philadelphian lodge in London had gone into opposition also as a unit of organization.

Why did Marx never bring into open debate the contacts of V. Le Lubez and his followers with the masonic movement? The probable solution is that he may have been bound by the tenth paragraph of the Provisional Code of Rules. Reflecting the balance of powers on the morrow of its formation, this point of the document of the International stated that "those workmen's societies which join the International Workmen's Association, although becoming a part of the eternal alliance of brotherly cooperation, will intactly preserve their own organization."⁹⁶ The same principle applied — mainly in the first period — to the admittance of individuals. Belonging to a bourgeois party or organization could occasionally exclude admittance into the International, but belonging to a masonic lodge, especially to the "Underground Masonry", did not! It was just this uncertainty that opened the way for debates concerning ideology and organization. Some members of the International — unconsciously or on purpose — failed to differentiate between a secret society within the organization and the participation of some members in conspirative groups. It was exactly the delegates opposing the Supreme Council who confused these two issues at the congress in the Hague in 1872. W. West e.g. who, represented Section No. 12 of the USA and professed petty bourgeois and mystical ideas — besides, whose mandate was not even affirmed by the congress — sprang on the delegates the question: "Do we have right to profess whatever ideas we wish to profess? You say there are spiritists among us — but are there no freemasons among yourselves?" In defending the expelled members of the Alliance led by Bakunin, the Spanish C. Alerini said: "Is there a single word in the Code of Rules against our membership in a secret society? There is not!" And P. J. Pluse, attacking the Supreme Council, applied a rather strange logic in developing further the same idea: "We are told that its Code (of the Alliance — M. K.) is in contradiction with the Basic Code of the International; but does not the Grand Orient (i.e. The masonic lodge — M. K.) also contradict the International? And we have a good many freemasons among us! You would be very much surprised if I demanded their expulsion; but we have the same reason to be surprised at the verdict of the committee."⁹⁷

Thus even in 1872 it raised great difficulties to stand up against the masonic groups within the labour movement. When Marx and the leaders gradually accepting his ideology had at last succeeded in defeating the group of Le Lubez, nothing was said about their belonging to the "Underground

Masonry". That they were petty bourgeois revolutionaries and that they had conspirative tactics was emphasized all the more. Drawing the lesson from this conflict, the Supreme Council of the International accepted some measures hindering the influx of such politicians into this organization, meant to profess the overt struggle of the working class.⁹⁸ All this took place, however, not immediately after the formation of the 1st International, but several months later.

The Estrangement of Bakunin from Freemasonry

His membership in masonic lodges and his conspirative contacts thus did not place an unsurmountable obstacle in Bakunin's way towards the working class movement. His masonic activity was not on common grounds with the standpoint of the French Philadelphians. The reason for this was partly the fact that the connections between left-wing freemasonry and the labour movement differed in each country and in each period.

In countries with a more developed labour movement — e.g. in Britain in the middle of the 1860s — the substantial and formal traditions of left-wing freemasonry more and more proved to be a hindrance in the struggles of the working class. Certainly, the idea of the social and political rise of the working people had a role in the movement. However, this role subordinate even in the "rebel" lodges, and underlying it were, more often than not, the principles of class peace, irrealism, or idealism. Regardless of the subjective strives of some of its members, the movement no longer sufficed for the needs of the age. As we have seen, during the debates on the basic documents of the International, composed by Marx, the Marxist views clashed with the objectives of the Mazzinists in London and the petty bourgeois democrats of the Philadelphian lodge. As an organization, the International proclaimed open class struggle on a world-wide scale — which, although it was not possible legally to pursue an organizing and agitating activity everywhere, could never be reconciled with left-wing masonic tactics, tenaciously sticking to petty bourgeois conspirative traditions.

In countries with a less developed social structure, however — thus in Italy, where Bakunin settled down for a period —, the role of left-wing freemasonry was not so regressive; it was only its perspectives that endangered the development of the labour movement. From the beginning of the 1860s, some freemasons in Florence — viz. G. Dolfi, N. Lo Savio, C. Lunel, A. Martinati and, entering their movement in 1864, Bakunin himself — tried to drive the agents of the governing authorities and the liberal haute bourgeoisie out of the leading bodies of the lodges. The activity of Dolfi and his followers shows, however, that as a whole the labour movement was rather primitive at the time. While neglecting the struggle for higher wages, they considered it one of their chief tasks to carry on an aural and written anticlerical propaganda among workers under Catholic influence.⁹⁹

The freemasonry in Southern Italy requires an even more subtle analysis. In the middle and at the end of the 1860s, it is occasionally almost impossible to distinguish political actions against the authorities from the afoundations or reformations of left-wing masonic lodges.¹⁰⁰ In Britain it was almost exclusively working-class aristocrats who were admitted and who partook in the life of the lodges (which often required financial contributions as well).¹⁰¹ In Southern Italy, on the contrary, destitute workers and small-scale producers of peasant origin from Naples and Palermo were always welcome at the meetings of the lodges led by radical politicians. *G. Cerrito* gave an excellent summary of the many-sided organizing work carried out by *Saverio Friscia* — the best-known local disciple of Bakunin and an active "brother" — immediately before the first meeting of the Bakuninist trend of the International in Palermo. "The friends and the faithful voters" of the Sicilian politician gathered in a company called by the authorities an "intimate circle". When necessary, this could take the name of a masonic lodge, or a centre for recruitment for Garibaldi, an administrative electoral committee or, latter, an Internationalist section. The masonic lodge of a village, which was similar to Saverio Friscia's "intimate circle", had managed to make a mayor of the left-wing Garibaldist lawyer D. Imbertone, who stood up against the oppression of the working class and who later joined the International. There are many more examples.¹⁰²

Not only in Sicily and in Naples, but in many other Italian provinces, the lodges under the leadership of radicals occasionally intermixed with the local "families" of Bakunin's conspirative organizations (and also with the communities of a fiercely anticlerical organization called Internationalist Section, struggling instinctively for higher wages and federalism).¹⁰³ In Italy there were no trade unions in the English or in the German way (with its long decades of experience, the latter also served as a basis for the workers for their political fight for better wages). Consequently, in several provinces of Italy, the left-wing lodges seem to have had a determining role in the formation of the local organized workers' movement.

At the turn of the decade, however, the rising of the working class movement in Europe necessarily involved a critical approach to freemasonry in Italy as well; it was a part of the larger process of the separation of the labour movement from the bourgeois and petty bourgeois trends. In Italy, this process came relatively late, and it was not consistently realized, either.¹⁰⁴ Criticizing the theory of class peace, it was at this time that Bakunin wrote to the well-known Garibaldist and freemason *C. Ceretti*: "Returning to the idea of a congress of Italian democracy, I must tell you never hoped, or wished to see the impossible reconciliation and harmony between all the opinions, between really progressive personalities and those who consider themselves or pretend to be as such: between freemasons, Campanella, Stefanioni, Filioppanti and the others, and honest socialist revolutionaries. — If it was ever realized, in my opinion this peace would be the greatest catastrophe that could strike upon Italy, because in all logic $+1-1=0$."¹⁰⁵

Where does this realization come from? What made Bakunin regard freemasonry "the International of the bourgeoisie"?

From 1864 — the foundation of the "Société" —, Bakunin gradually came into conflict, during his conspirative activity, with the petty bourgeois revolutionaries in Italy and with the republicans supporting G. Mazzini of G. Garibaldi. He also had to stand up against the manifestations of the ideology of the liberal and petty bourgeoisie, who still participated, together with him, in the sessions of the lodges. First he fought his moderate "brothers" on a theoretical level. His "Revolutionary Catechism", intended for this purpose, does not appear to have fulfilled its function.¹⁰⁶ Then he set out to reform the lodges and to found new communities. His purposes no longer coincided with those of the movement: he was paving the way for the system of the "families" of the "Société", which was aiming at a "social reorganization" of the world. As G. Cerrito writes, he was too impatient to wait until the "in abis" formation of an organization gathering popular forces, and rather attempted to fill the forms already in existence with new contents. In the period of the strengthening of the International this proved impossible to realize if not in Southern Italy, certainly, in international relations and among the working class. This insoluble conflict had to bring Bakunin to an open conflict with freemasonry, which had, all over the continent, the liberal bourgeoisie behind it.

How gradually this took place is worth following along. In London in autumn 1864, Bakunin, who often proved to be unable to be discrete, still took so seriously one of the chief principles of freemasonry — "secrecy before outsiders" — that he refused to talk of his participation in the movement even to his old friends A. I. Herzen and N. P. Ogaryov.¹⁰⁷ That his masonic contacts were long-lasting can be seen from the letter of credence that he received on his departure from Florence in May 1865, from Section IV. a. (in the Arno-valley) of the "Grande Oriente", the controlling organization of the "Il Progresso Sociale".¹⁰⁸

The first important proof of his estrangement from freemasonry is a letter that Bakunin wrote to A. I. Herzen and N. P. Orgaryov on March 23rd, 1866: "... my friends, do not think that I have ever been seriously preoccupied in freemasonry," he wrote from Naples to London. "It may be useful as a mask or as a passport; but seeking (revolutionary — M. K.) activity in freemasonry ... is as hopeless as finding remedy in wine."¹⁰⁹

In this letter Bakunin counterposed his former activity in the lodges to the international actions bringing about the "Société". Although most of his acquaintance in Italy were still freemasons — moreover, the core of the "family" in Mezzogiorno was exclusively made up by well-known "brothers" —, Bakunin himself no longer kept the rules of the movement — which we could see from his letter. The time of his opposition may thus have been the last months of 1866; the letter cited above dates from that period. When later, settling down in Switzerland, Bakunin actively joined the International, he no longer had to comply with the left-wing masonic traditions of his environment. Even more importantly, without losing sight of the objectives of the working class, his views were growing

more and more subtle as concerns the labour movement. It was at this time that he wrote his often cited description of the role of freemasonry, positive at first and turning more and more negative afterwards, in the enlightenment and in the period of bourgeois revolutions.¹¹⁰

Even after he had got beyond the system of "general" democracy and had broken with left-wing freemasonry as a movement and a trend in ideology, Bakunin still had a number of freemasons in his political environment. According to his close collaborator *J. Guillaume*, in the code of rules of the most famous society under Bakunin's direction, the "Alliance", belonging to a lodge did not exclude membership.¹¹¹ There were even such followers of Bakunin — e.g. the well-known French journalist *Elie Reclus* — who first joined the "Société" in the 1860s, and then the lodges in 1873.¹¹²

Like his activity therein, Bakunin's relations with the movement after his estrangement was not unambiguous, either. As we have seen, such relations had facilitated his activity in the formation of the "Société", just as his tour of recruitment in Europe in 1864. In the political storm stirred by the issuing of the "Syllabus", like several other representatives of left-wing freemasonry close to him, Bakunin also felt obliged to take definite steps against the Catholic church, which had regained its strength after the cyclical letter. The counter-attack of the anticlerical forces in Italy did not prove effective in the years that followed, mainly because of the very narrow diffusion of the anticlerical press among the inhabitants. The inability of the left-wing lodges, the opportunism of the influential principals, and the lack of the formation of an atheistic trend must have made Bakunin realize more and more that he had to search elsewhere after friends-in-arms — viz. in the international working class movement. "Catholicism! Franc Maçonnerie! Once irreconcilable opposites, both in life and as forces. And now they are two phantoms, keeping on offending each other according to the old traditions and pretending to be alive — and in the meantime their graves are being dug by the gigantic reality and youth called International", he wrote to G. Mazzoni, who had become the head of Italian freemasonry in the meantime, on December 16th. 1871.¹¹³

Ultimately, the masonic influence on Bakunin had proved rather deep, both in ideology and in matters of organization. Its most permanent manifestation can be seen in his anti-theologism. Still, it could not have determined his career after 1866. As his becoming a "brother" seems to have been almost necessary, it was likewise normal that he was estranged from, and came to conflict with the movement. If not harmful, left-wing freemasonry was certainly a detour for Bakunin on his way towards the labour movement. It must be considered his merit, however, that Bakunin realized in time, and broke through the limits of, freemasonry, this movement with a bourgeois disposition.

NOTES

- ¹ Recently some remarkable works have been published, however: *Landa, S. S.*: O nekotorykh osobennost'jax formirovaniya revoliucionnoj ideologii v Rossii, 1816–1820, in: Pushkin i jego vremja, I. Leningrad, 1962; *Id.*: Konspiracije osviesceniowe i tajne organizacii polityczne, Przegląd Historyczny, 1967/2; *Hass, L.*: „Diaspora” polskiego wolnomularstwa (1821–1908), ibid. 1971/2; *Id.*: Materyaly do dziejow wolnomularstwa wielkiej Emigracji, ibid. 1975/5; *H. Balázs Éva*: A magyar jozefinisták külföldi kapcsolatai [The foreign contacts of the Hungarian Josephinians], Századok, 1969/6; *L. Nagy Zsuzsa*: A szabadkőművesség közéleti szerepe a két háború között [The public role of freemasonry between the two wars], Századok, 1973/3; *Id.*: A szabadkőművesség a XX. században [Freemasonry in the 20th century], Budapest, 1977.
- ² *M. Nettlau*: Michael Bakunin, Eine Biographie, London, 1896–1900, p. 200, vol. II. See also the unpublished Appendix to the same work: Nachträgen, I. I. S. G. Archivum (Amsterdam).
- ³ *M. Nettlau*: op. cit. p. 200, vol. II.
- ⁴ *G. Domanico*: L'Internazionale (1864–1870), Florence, 1911, pp. 180–183.
- ⁵ *Documents anarchistes* N2, juillet, 1969 (Lyon), pp. 47–48.
- ⁶ *E. Lenucoff–O. Posner*: Internationales Freimaurerlexikon, München–Zürich–Wien, 1932, 119.
- ⁷ *Ju. Steklov*: Mihail Aleksandrovič Bakunin, ego zhizn' i dejatel'nost', Moscow–Leningrad, 1927, pp. 290–293, vol. II. „Was Bakunin a member of the masonic lodge? I must presume he was, it was absolutely necessary for him, if he wished to achieve anything in this layer of the freethinking bourgeoisie.” op. cit. 290. II.
- ⁸ On the history of Russian freemasonry at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries see Masonstvo v ego proshlom i nastojaschem, pod. red. *S. P. Melgunova i N. P. Sidorova*, Moscow, 1914–1915, I–II; *A. N. Pipin*: Russkoje masonstvo, Petrograd, 1916; *G. A. Gukovskij*: Očerki po istorii russkoj literaturnoj mysli v XVIII v., Leningrad, 1938; *T. Bakounine*: Répertoire biographique des Francs-Maçons Russes (XVIII^e et XIX^e siècles), Paris, 1967.
- ⁹ *L. Hass*: „Diaspora” Polskiego wolnomularstwa (1821–1908), Przegląd Historyczny 1971/2. 202–210.
- ¹⁰ See the contribution of *V. M. Dalin*, in: Problemi sovjetsko-italjanskoj istoriografii, Moscow, 1964, 250–251.
- ¹¹ On the public activity of the Turgenevs in France see: *V. M. Tarasova*: N. I. Turgenev v Zapadnoj Evrope v 30–50-ch godach XIX v. i ego obscestvenno-političeskie svjazi in: Učenyje zapis'ki Marijskogo Gos. Ped. Instituta im. N. K. Krupskoj, Kafedra Istorii, vol. 28. Joskarola, 1966, 85–136; *M. Cadot*: La Russie dans la vie intellectuelle française 1839–1859, Paris, 1967; *W. Śliwowska*: W kregu poprzedników Herzena, Wrocław-Warsaw–Kraków–Gdańsk, 1971, 96–140. On N. I. Sazonov see in the first place the study of the greatest Marx-scholar: *D. Rjazanov*: Karl Marks i russkije ljudi sorokovyh godov. Petrograd, 1978, 7–56; further, *W. Śliwowska*: op. cit. 207–257; on I. G. Golovin see *M. Lemke*: Nikolajevskije zandarmy i literatura 1825–1855, gg. Sankt–Peterburg, 1909, 466–511.
- ¹² Фартук — шпана
M. Bakunin:
Internationale Loge Orient de Paris
S.: L.: O.: Paris
— три года —
- ¹³ *J. Pfützer*: Bakuninstudien, Prag, 1932, 140. It cannot be too often pointed out that his stay in Siberia represents one of the most contradictory periods in his career. Ideologically, a process can be seen here to begin with the Russian revolutionary, compelled to spend years several thousand miles away from European Russia and Western Europe. Bakunin was turning towards literalism and was ready for a compromise with the liberals in Russia. This is what explain, in practice, his great confidence in local Siberian authorities, and even in Alexander II's reform endeavours. It took him considerably long gradually to get disappointed — which, among others, led him to the idea of escape in the end. This period — which, in the final account, cannot at all be called progressive — did, however, have a positive result: Bakunin was forced to stay away from the inner antagonisms that

- prevailed among emigrants of the revolutions in 1848 and could thus later re-enter political life without having his faith shattered in social progress.
- ¹⁴ *Michail Bakunin: Izbrannye sočinenija*, Peterburg – Moscow, 1920. 80. IV.
- ¹⁵ In his letter to J. Cwierczakiewicz on October 18th 1862 concerning the Polish – Russian talks, he wrote about a mutual acquaintance, "Will you please leave his name unmentioned. . . in lodge correspondence." *Ju. Steklov: Pis'ma M. Bakunina k polskim korespondentam*, in: *Letopisi marksizma*, 1927/4, 80.
- ¹⁶ The masonic traditions of the royal family and the high officials in Sweden go back to the middle of the 18th century. They attained real significance when, following the example of Frederic II of Prussia, Gustavus III – a characteristic monarch of enlightened absolutism – joined the masonic "brotherhood". Naturally, he availed himself of the possibilities offered by the lodges to strengthen his power. However, G. A. Rejterholm, a leader with liberal pretensions of a group which was later to overthrow the king, could also employ the lodge meetings for conspirative purposes, as he was an influential principal of the movement. *Istorija Šveitsii* Red. A. Kan, Moscow, 1974. 311, 319.
- ¹⁷ On his stay in Sweden see *Ju. Steklov: Michail Aleksandrovič Bakunin: op. cit.* 223 – 226, II; *Illustrad Tidning* (Stockholm), April 24, July 13, 1863; Hellberg I. C. (Posthumus). *Ur minnet och dalboken*, mina samtido, XI – XII. Stockholm, 1974; Kihlberg, Leif: *Lars Hierta i helfig, Stockholm*, 1968; Hasselberg Gudmar, Rudolf Wall, Dagens Nyjeters skapane, Stockholm, 1945. In any event, their masonic membership did not prevent the right-wing governing circles in Sweden from opening a campaign against Bakunin, under the pressure of St. Petersburg, after the first friendly meetings with the Russian revolutionary.
- ¹⁸ Besides contemporary pamphlets, the period in question of the Italian freemasonry is best detailed in *A. Luzio: La massoneria e il Risorgimento italiano*, vols. I, II. Bologna, 1925. Politically, however, the author belonged to the right wing of the scholars of the Risorgimento at the beginning of the century, and as such he wished to "sort out" the sources relating to the formation of the left wing of the movement. He is partial – sometimes even sarcastic – when writing about the activity of pro-Garibaldi masonic officials. The shortcomings of his work are pointed out by the well-known antifascist historian *N. Roselli*, in: *Saggi sul Risorgimento e altri scritti*, Turin, 1946, 335 – 346. Although based on fewer sources, *G. Leti's* work is far more objective: *Carboneria e massoneria nel Risorgimento italiano*, Bologna, 1925; in several questions the author polemizes with A. Luzio. *G. Ditto: Massoneria, carboneria e altre società segrete del Risorgimento italiano*, Turin – Rome, 1905 is interesting rather for its account of the history of early Italian freemasonry. References to the role of freemasonry in the Risorgimento in the monumental work of the Marxist *G. Candeloro* are also worthy of mention: *Istorija sovremennoj Italii*, I – V, Moscow, 1958 – 1971.
- ¹⁹ *Magda Jászay: Lodovico Frapolli e gli emigranti ungherisi nel Risorgimento*, in: *Rassegna storica del Risorgimento*, 1960, 531 – 566.
- ²⁰ *G. Candeloro: op. cit.* 93 – 94, v.
- ²¹ *A. Luzio: op. cit.* 50 – 51, II; *G. Leti: op. cit.* 337 – 345.
- ²² *A. Luzio: op. cit.* 27, II. The author is rather sceptical in the evaluation of the ensuing gaining ground of G. Garibaldi's trend in the masonic movement; the statistics, however, contained in a footnote is worth noticing: there were 40 Italian lodges in 1863, 77 in 1865, and 121 in 1868 choosing Garibaldi as their patron. *Op. cit.* 20, II.
- ²³ Klapka heritage, Hungarian National Archives, R – 295 (masonic documents). According to a report on June 27th in the journal "Il Popolo d'Italia", B. Odicini, G. Dolfi, A. Mario, A. de Gubernatis and other well-known republicans in Florence paid a visit to the consul of the U. S. A. in Florence and delivered latter assuring his country of their sympathies with the Northerners. The deliverers of the letter were also activists and leaders of the leaders of the "Il Progresso Sociale". Similarly to the one in Turin, was this also an instance of republican-masonic cooperation? See Supplement 2.
- ²⁴ On the nation-wide outrage following the "Syllabus" and the Pope's cyclical letter "Quanta Cura" see *G. Candeloro: op. cit.* 312 – 315, V.
- ²⁵ *G. Leti: Carboneria e massoneria nel Risorgimento italiano*, Bologna, 1925, 359 – 368.
- ²⁶ *Elio Conti: Le origini del socialismo a Firenze (1860 – 1880)*, Rome, 1950, 79; on the history of the lodge "Concordia" see *G. Vagaggia: Storia della Loggia massonica fiorentina Concordia (1861 – 1911)*, Milan, 1911, a partially masonic-centric work.

- ²⁷ The Diaries of Gyula Tanárky, National Archives, R – 195.
- ²⁸ I. V. Grigorjeva: K istorii obščestvenno-revoljucionnykh svyazei meždu Rossijej i Italijej v 60 – 90 gody XX v. in: Konferencija istorikov, 8 – 10 aprelja, 1968, Moscow, 1970.
- ²⁹ See e.g. his note in his diary on November 5th 1865; “Tonight... the initiation of V[ogt] (i.e. Karl Vogt – M. K.) at the lodge... Odicini expounds among others the political principles of the lodge: Socialists, rationalists, suffrage universelle.” The Diaries of Gyula Tanárky, op. cit. And 10 days later: “Tonight at the lodge: lecture. By Odicini on its history. News of the arrival of brother Garibaldi.” The Diaries of Gyula Tanárky.
- ³⁰ „... at the first three stages there is only charity, so Pulszky says”, Gyula Tanárky noted on December 17th, 1863. op. cit.
- ³¹ E. Conti: op. cit. 79.
- ³² L. Hass: „Diaspora”... op. cit. 213 – 214.
- ³³ Bakunin was not the first Russian exile L. Frapolli established political connections with; e.g. N. I. Sazonov wrote in superlatives about him to Marx already in May 1850. D. Rjazanov: op. cit. 34. M. Nettelau makes mention of a latent letter of Bakunin dating February 4th, 1864, where the names L. Frapolli, György Klapka and K. Vogt can be found. See M. Nettelau: Bakunin e l'Internazionale in Italia dal 1864 al 1872, Ginevra, 1928, 26.
- ³⁴ The heritage of Pulszky, the Manuscript Archives of the National Széchényi Library. VIII/869.
- ³⁵ E. Conti: Alcuni documenti relativi al soggiorno fiorentino Michele Bakunin (1864 – 1865). Movimento Operaio, 1950, 123 – 124, II – III. On the masonic contacts in Italy of A. Blanche see Ridderstad, C: Regnbogen, Interiörer from olika tider, Linköping, 1882, 530 – 533. According to this work A. Blanche was adopted by the Italian freemasonry already in Genova.
- ³⁶ This can be proved by comparing the cited letter of Frapolli attesting Bakunin's grade “Chevalier du Soleil” with the letter of credence handed to him on his departure from Florence, published by M. Nettelau. Cf. M. Nettelau: Bakunin e l'Internazionale in Italia dal 1864 al 1872, Ginevra, 1928, 23 – 24.
- ³⁷ On the possessors of the thirty-third grade of Italian freemasonry see further A. Luzio: op. cit. 111 – 112, II, and the photographs supplemented.
- ³⁸ “Aftonbladet”, October 19th, 1864.
- ³⁹ “L'Italia Popolo”, September 22nd, 1865.
- ⁴⁰ L. Krusius – Ahrenberg: “Internationella Brödraskop” och Aftonladsradikalismen vid mitten av 1860 – talet, in: Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift för politik, statistik, ekonomi, Agn. 56/1, 1953. 41 – 74.
- ⁴¹ Ibid.
- ⁴² Ju. Steklov: M. A. Bakunin... 222. II.
- ⁴³ See Bakunin's publicistic series in the Stockholm journal Aftonbladet: Sept. 28, Oct. 12, 19, Nov. 15, 17, 19, Dec. 12, 15, 1864 and Jan. 7, 1865.
- ⁴⁴ Manuscript sur la Franc-Maçonnerie, 1865. – Archivum I. I. S. G. (Amsterdam).
- ⁴⁵ Although with different content, he still used Hegelian terminology in this period of his life. Cf. G. I. Virubov: Revoljucionnyje vospominanija, in: Vestnik Evropy, 1913, 56, II.
- ⁴⁶ H. Tyemkinowa: Bakunin i antinomije wolnosci, Warsaw, 1964, 167 – 199.
- ⁴⁷ Je. L. Rudnickaja – V. A. Djakov: Rukopis' M. A. Bakunina „Meždunarodnoje obščestvo osvobodnija čelovečenstva“ (1864) in: Revoljucionnaja situacija v Rossii v 1859 – 1861 gg, Moscow, 1974, 322. (Further: The program document of the “Société”.)
- ⁴⁸ M. Bakunin: Izbrannyje sočinenija, Moscow, – Petersbrough 1919. 159, II.
- ⁴⁹ The program document of the “Société”, op. cit. 324.
- ⁵⁰ Manuscript sur la Franc-Maçonnerie, op. cit.
- ⁵¹ M. Bakunin: Izbrannyje sočinenija, op. cit. 161, II. It is interesting to juxtapose the theses of J. P. Proudhon and Bakunin: “If God exists, he is man's enemy” (Proudhon), “If God exists, he must be destroyed” (Bakunin). See Anarchizm, Sbornik, I. Moscow, 1907, 34.
- ⁵² See on this the program of the “Société”: op. cit. 327, and the first Code of Rules of the “Société”, Kungl. Biblioteket Stockholm, August Sohlmans polit. Korrespondens, Eg. S 42. In the 1866 version of the document as well, Bakunin states that only an atheist can belong to the international family (i.e. to the superordinate organization in fact) of the illegal society. Materialy dlja biografii Bakunina pod. red. V. Polonskogo, Moscow – Leningrad, 1928. 69. II.)

- ⁵³ *M. Bakunin: Államiság és anarchia* [State and Anarchy], Budapest, 1976, 380. (manuscript) (Perhaps it is needless to add that this is another instance revealing Bakunin's (by no means rare) inconsistency in his ideological development.)
- ⁵⁴ *Manuscript sur Franc-Maçonnerie*, op. cit. Quoted incorrectly in: *Documentes anarchistes*, N.°, juillet, 1969, 46–47.
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁶ See on this *M. Nettlau: Michael Bakunin, Eine Biographie*, op. cit. 201, II.
- ⁵⁷ *J. M. Robertson: A history of Freethought in the nineteenth century*, London, 1969, 468–470, II. In 1865 Bakunin established contacts with the freethinkers in Sienna. *A. Romano: Storia del movimento socialista in Italia*, Bari, 1966, 179, I.
- ⁵⁸ *G. Cerrito: Radicalismo e socialismo in Sicilia (1860–1882)*, Messina, Florence, 1958, 69.
- ⁵⁹ *M. Nettlau: Bakunine e l'Internazionale in Italia*, op. cit. 22. This renowned researcher of Bakunin was a personal acquaintance of A. Tucci – thus his publication can be considered more authentic.
- ⁶⁰ *The program document of the "Société"*, op. cit. 313 320–322, 324. In Bakunin's views schools must replace the church. *Ibid.* 327. This can be found word by word in the "Revolutionary Catechism". See *Materialy dlja biografii M. Bakunina*, pod. red. V. Polonskogo, Moscow, 1928, 62, III. (Further: "Revolutionary Catechism".)
- ⁶¹ In his memoirs A. de Gubernatis called the members of the Florence branch of the "Société" his "brothers". *A. de Gubernatis: Proemio autobiografico*, in: *Dizionario degli Scrittori Contemporanei*, Firenze, 1879, p. xxiv. *Id.*: *Fibra*, Rome, 1900, 236.
- ⁶² *Revolutionary Catechism*: op. cit. 39.
- ⁶³ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁴ *Revolutionary Catechism*: op. cit. 86.
- ⁶⁵ *A. de Gubernatis: Fibra*, op. cit. 227.
- ⁶⁶ *Revolutionary Catechism*: op. cit. 82.
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid.* 82–84.
- ⁶⁸ *T. Sokolovskaja: Russkoje masonstvo i jego značenie v istorii obščestvennogo dviženija (XVIII i pervaja četvert' XIX stoletija)* St. Petersburg, n. d. 108.
- ⁶⁹ *V. Polonskij: M. A. Bakunin – jakobinec. Vestnik Kommunističeskoj Akademii*, 1926 (18), 60.
- ⁷⁰ *N. I. Nepomnjasčaja – N. Ju. Kolpinskij: Dva pis'ma J. Ph. Beckera o revoljucionnom dviženii v Italii*, in: *Novaja i novejšaja istorija*, 1965/5, 131–138; also cf. the letter of G. Mazzoni to J. Ph. Becker, *Archiv Instituta Marksizma – Leninizma pri CK KPSS*, (Moscow), f. 185, op. 1. ed. hr. 72/17.
- ⁷¹ *Études et documents sur la Première Internationale en Suisse*, Publiés sous la direction de Jacques Freymond, Geneva, 1964, 269.
- ⁷² *V. Polonskij: M. A. Bakunin, Novyje materialy*, Krasnyj Archiv, 1926/4, 77–78. As it was at first only in Italy that the Société achieved concrete results as an organization, such writings usually remained dead letters.
- ⁷³ On the activity of the freemasons Ch. Longet and J. Becker see *B. I. Nicolaevsky: Secret Societies and the First International in: The Revolutionary Internationals 1864–1945*, Stansford, 1966, 37–38. *N. J. Utin*: information of his membership in the masonic movement comes from D. Rjazanov to B. Porshnev, who has done some research on Bakunin for a short time (and from B. Porshnev to the author).
- ⁷⁴ *V. A. Smirnova: Konstituirovanie Pervogo Internacionala kak meždunarodnoj massovoj organizacii proletariata (ot učreditel'nogo sobranija 28 sentjabrja 1864 goda do ženevskogo kongressa v sentjabre 1866 goda)*, Avtoreferat, Moscow, 1966.
- ⁷⁵ *B. I. Nikolaevsky: op. cit.* 37. *L. Hass: Materialy do dziejow wolnemularstwa Wielkiej Emigracji*, op. cit. 558–559.
- ⁷⁶ *B. I. Nikolaevsky: op. cit.* 36.
- ⁷⁷ In Marxist literature see on the subject *F. A. Rotstein: Očerki po istorii rabočego dviženija v Anglii*, Moscow – Leningrad, 1925, 178–186; *D. B. Rjazanov: Vozniknovenije Pervogo Internacionala in Archiv K. Marksa i F. Engelsa*, Moscow, 1924, 105–188, I.
- ⁷⁸ *G. Leti: op. cit.* 307–308.
- ⁷⁹ *D. B. Rjazanov: op. cit.*; *B. A. Rožkov: Anglijskoje rabočeje dviženije (1859–1864 gg.)* Moscow, 1973, 179–221. *L. B. Golman: Ot Sojuza kommunistov k Peromu Internacionalu*, Moscow, 1964, 9–73. *G. D. H. Cole: Socialist thought. Marxism and Anarchism 1850–1890*, London, 1957, 88–134, II; *A. Lehning: International association, 1855–*

1859. in: *From Bounarroti to Bakunin. Studies international socialism*. Leiden, 1970. 150–260.
- ⁸⁰ B. I. Nicolaevsky: op. cit. 51–53.
- ⁸¹ F. A. Rotstein: op. cit. 126–161; Ju. N. Steklov: *Internacional (1864–1914)*, Petrograd 1918, 26–31. I–II.
- ⁸² D. B. Rjazanov: op. cit. 128–132. On the official meeting of the British and French workers in 1862 see E. Collins – Ch. Agramsky: *Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement. Years of the First International*. London, 1965, 24.
- ⁸³ *Karl Marx és Friedrich Engels Művei* [Works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (further: M. E. W. Budapest, 1973. p. 11. vol. 31.
- ⁸⁴ On the early activity of V. Le Lubez in the Supreme Council of the International see more in details *General'nyj Sovjet Pervogo Internacionala. 1864–1866. Londonskaja konferencija, 1865 goda*, Protokoly, Moscow, 1961.
- ⁸⁵ On their activity in the masonic movement and in the International see L. Hass: op. cit. 558–559; J. W. Borezja: *W kregu wielkich wygnancow*, Warsaw, 1963, 42, 479.
- ⁸⁶ B. I. Nikolaevsky: op. cit. 51–56; Cfr. *Pervyj International*: op. cit. 67–78.
- ⁸⁷ D. B. Rjazanov: op. cit. 148.
- ⁸⁸ V. A. Smirnova: *Iz istorii sozdanija programnyh dokumentov Pervogo Internacionala in: Iz istorii marksizma i mezhdunarodnogo rabocogo dvizhenija*, Moscow, 1963, 280–297;
- ⁸⁹ M. E. W.: op. cit. 16. vol. 31. "It was extremely difficult to compose it in such a way as making our conception appear in a form acceptable for the present state of the labour movement. In a few weeks these people will hold electoral meetings with Bright and Cobden. It will take some time until the renewed movement allows for the old valiance of expression", the letter runs.
- ⁹⁰ Ibid. 12.
- ⁹¹ On the conflict itself see V. A. Smirnova: op. cit. 333–334.
- ⁹² Ibid. 333.
- ⁹³ *Pervyj International*: op. cit. 286–287.
- ⁹⁴ *General'nyj Sovjet Pervogo Internacionala, 1864–1866. Londonskaja Konferencija 1865 goda*, Protokoly, Moscow, 1961, 195.
- ⁹⁵ Ibid. 219.
- ⁹⁶ Ibid. 58–59, 170, 172.
- ⁹⁷ *Geagskij Kongress Pervogo Internacionala*, Moscow, 1972, 211, 218–219.
- ⁹⁸ *General'nyj Sovjet* . . . Moscow, 1961, 195–199.
- ⁹⁹ E. Conti: *Le origini del socialismo a Firenze (1860–1880)*, Rome, 1950. See also A. Salvestrini: Giuseppe Dolfi, in: *Rassegna storica Toscana*, 1969, 221–232.
- ¹⁰⁰ G. Cerrito: op. cit. 113.
- ¹⁰¹ A szabadműveltség és a társadalomtudomány, kioktató előadások gyűjteménye, német nyelven tartotta dr. Mandello Károly, a Galilei-páholy tagja, az 1893. évtől kezdve; kézirat TTV számára, Budapest, 1902. I. 28. [Freemasonry and social sciences, a series of instructive lectures held in German by Dr. Ch. Mandello, member of the "Galilei" lodge, from the year 1893 onwards; manuscript for the H [onorable] B [rothers], Budapest, Jan. 28th 1902].
- ¹⁰² G. Cerrito: op. cit. 114, 121–122.
- ¹⁰³ Ibid. 113.
- ¹⁰⁴ Ju. M. Steklov: M. A. Bakunin . . . op. cit. 312–353, II; on the new Marxist definition of Bakunin's Southern Italian environment see N. Ju. Kolpinskij: *Dejatel'nost' F. Engelsa v gody I. Internacionala*, Moscow, 1971, 136–137.
- ¹⁰⁵ *Pis'ma Bakunina k Celsio Ceretti in: Nasha Strana, Istoricheskij sbornik*, St. Petereburg, 1907, 21–22.
- ¹⁰⁶ G. Cerrito: op. cit. 97.
- ¹⁰⁷ *Pis'ma M. A. Bakunina k A. I. Gercenu i N. P. Ogarjovu*, St. Petersburg, 1906, 271.
- ¹⁰⁸ M. Nettlau: *Bakunin e l'Internazionale in Italia dal 1864 al 1872*, Geneva, 1928, 28.
- ¹⁰⁹ *Pis'ma M. A. Bakunina k A. I. Gercenu* . . . , ibid. But to all appearances Herzen still regarded Bakunin as belonging to the movement for a time; as he wrote sarcastically to N. P. Ogarjov on August 27th, 1867, "he can speak like a freemason, a democrat, a socialist, a theologian of atheism, etc.". A. I. Gereen: *Sobranije sočinenij v 30-i tomach*, Moscow, 1963, 195, XXIX.

- ¹¹⁰ *M. A. Bakunin*: Izbrannyje sočinenija, op. cit. 80–81, III. As for his contacts with the Italian lodges and their members after 1868, we know of none that were fruitful. In a letter to G. Mazzoni on December 16th, 1871 he mocked at the movement. And in 1872 he straightly described freemasonry as belonging to the right wing of bourgeois and petty bourgeois democrats. A year later he mentioned the “Jewish freemasons” among his opponents in Germany, in an extremely condemning way. Cf. *G. Cerrito–P. Masini*: Quattro lettere di Bakunin a G. Mazzoni, *Movimento Operaio*, 1951/3, 621–622; *Pis'ma M. A. Bakunina k Celsio Ceretti* . . . op. cit. 16; *Ju. M. Steklov*: op. cit. 349.
- ¹¹¹ *M. Nettlau*: Eine Biographie, op. cit. 823–825, II.
- ¹¹² Archiv N. A. i N. P. Ogarjovych Sobral i podgotovil k pečati *M. Gershenzon*, Moscow–Leningrad, 1930, 175.
- ¹¹³ *G. Cerrito–P. C. Masini*: Quattro lettere . . . op. cit. 622.